	Case 2:24-cv-01656-GMN-BNW	Documer	nt 28	Filed 02/20/25	Page 1 of 4				
1 2 3 4 5 6	CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTROFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNGERALDINE LARGO, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 15023 5100 West Sahara Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89146 Telephone: (702) 799-5373 Facsimile: (702) 799-7243 Email: castigm1@nv.ccsd.net Attorney for Defendant								
7	Clark County School District								
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT								
9	DISTRICT OF NEVADA								
10									
11 12	LEX TECNICA LTD, a Nevada limit liability company,	ted-	Case N	o.: 2:24-cv-01656-	GMN-BNW				
13	Plaintiff,		STIP	ULATION AND	[PROPOSED]				
14	VS.			ER TO EXTEND DEADLIN	DISCOVERY				
15	CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTR	RICT,		(FIRST REQU					
16	Defendant.			(IIII) I III Q	25.1)				
17									
18									
19	At Defendant Clark County School District's ("CCSD") request, the Parties, through								
20	their undersigned counsel, hereby stipulate and request that the discovery deadlines in this matter								
21	be continued for a short period of thirty (30) days, from the Court's prior Order (ECF No. 20) to								
22	facilitate transparency and potential settlement discussion. This Stipulation is supported by good								
23	cause, is the Parties' first request, and not for the purpose of delay.								
24	I. DISCOVERY COMPLETED TO DATE								
25	a. On December 6, 2024, Defendant served its initial disclosures.								
26	b. On December 6, 20	024, Plainti	ff serve	ed its initial disclos	ures.				
27	II. DISCOVERY THAT REMAINS TO BE COMPLETED								
28	a. Additional disclosures in the form of declarations and affidavits								

2

1

3 4

6 7

5

8 9

11

12

10

13

15

14

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28 The parties stipulate that no further written discovery will occur.

III. REASONS WHY REMAINING DISCOVERY HAS **NOT BEEN COMPLETED**

The Parties seek to extend the deadlines by thirty (30) days, starting with the discovery cut-off date forward. Neither party intends to extend the deadlines to amend pleadings add parties, initial expert disclosures, or rebuttal expert disclosures. Plaintiff counsel is in the process of preparing and finalizing declarations and affidavits attesting to reasonable rates in the market. 1 Upon receipt and review of those declarations and affidavits, Defense counsel will require additional time to counter said submissions or likewise prepare and collect declarations and affidavits from other special education law practitioners in the market.²

On February 5, 2025, Defense counsel inquired about the status of discovery and proposed for a stipulation to extend the discovery plan and scheduling order out of an abundance of caution in advance of the deadline to request an extension or modification of the discovery plan and scheduling order. The Defense counsel's proposal kept in mind that each of the Parties also had dispositive motions pending adjudication, which is why Defense counsel filed their Motion to Stay (ECF No. 25).. Initially the parties were unable to come to an agreement. Ultimately, the Parties agreed to continue discovery in good faith, on the condition that Defense counsel withdraw the Motion to Stay, while being mindful of the additional time need to gather and prepare declarations and affidavits from special education law practitioners in establishing a reasonable rate. Defense counsel herewith withdraws the Motion to Stay (ECF No. 25) to preserve judicial economy and advance justice.

/// ///

///

"The burden is on the fee applicant 'to produce satisfactory evidence' of the prevailing market rates." T.B. v. San Diego Unified Sch. Dist., 293 F. Supp. 3d 1177, 1188 (S.D. Cal. 2018) (citing Sam K. ex rel. Diane C. v. Hawaii Dep't of Educ., 788 F.3d 1033, 1041 (9th Cir. 2015)).

[&]quot;The party opposing the fee application has a burden of rebuttal that requires submission of evidence to the district court challenging the accuracy and reasonableness of the hours charged or the facts asserted by the prevailing party in its submitted affidavits." Gates v. Deukmejian, 987 F.2d 1392, 1397-98 (9th Cir. 1992).

IV. PROPOSED EXTENDED DEADLINES

The Parties respectfully request that this Court enter an Order granting this First Request for extension of discovery deadlines as follows:

	Current	Proposed
Discovery Cut-Off	March 12, 2025	April 11, 2025
Deadline to amend pleadings and add parties	December 12, 2024	CLOSED
Deadline for initial expert disclosures	January 13, 2025	CLOSED
Deadline for rebuttal expert disclosures	February 10, 2025	CLOSED
Deadline to file dispositive motions	April 11, 2025	May 12, 2025
Pre-Trial Order	May 12, 2025	June 11, 2025

Attorney for Defendant

Las Vegas, Nevada 89145

Attorneys for Plaintiff

ORDER

Based upon the foregoing Stipulation of the Parties, and for good cause appearing therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows:

	Current	Proposed
Discovery Cut-Off	March 12, 2025	April 11, 2025
Deadline to amend pleadings and add parties	December 12, 2024	CLOSED
Deadline for initial expert disclosures	January 13, 2025	CLOSED
Deadline for rebuttal expert disclosures	February 10, 2025	CLOSED
Deadline to file dispositive motions	April 11, 2025	May 12, 2025
Pre-Trial Order	May 12, 2025	June 11, 2025

IT IS SO ORDERED.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DATED: February 20, 2025